



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

survivor. His long record as a peacemaker is a source of inspiration to his colleagues on the board of directors of the Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society, and it is a further source of interest and inspiration to them that Mr. Baily was the first treasurer, and Mr. John B. Garrett, who is also a director of the society, was the first president of the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration. Their portraits and a copy of the petition referred to hang upon the walls of the society's headquarters in Philadelphia, and it is hoped by their colleagues that they may live to see the full fruition of their long and devoted efforts in behalf of international peace and justice.

The petition referred to is brief, and is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:*

The Petition of the Subscribers, inhabitants of the State of Pennsylvania—Respectfully Sheweth:

That your Petitioners are deeply impressed with the evils and miseries attendant on War; and most especially, in relation to that now existing between our beloved and highly favored country—and our distracted and oppressed neighbor, Mexico;—and we feel constrained to implore your Honorable and dignified body, as conservators of our country, and as the Constitutional Council of the Executive of the General Government, in wisdom, to devise some speedy and efficient means amicably to end this War; that so its demoralizing effects, and the effusion of human blood may be stayed; the blessing of those ready to perish, rest upon you; and peace and prosperity be secured to our country.

## One Hundred Years of Peace.

By William Isaac Hull.

A book with the above title, and written by a distinguished author, has just been published,\* presumably as a herald of the great celebration to be held in 1914 and 1915 of the centenary of peace between the United States and Great Britain. The paper cover supplied this book by the publishers announces that "in 1914 the American and English people will celebrate the completion of one hundred years of peace between the two nations. The significance of this fact is brought out by Senator Lodge in this brilliant and penetrating sketch of the relations of England and the United States since the War of 1812."

The book may be considered "brilliant and penetrating" by some others besides its publishers; but, as a matter of fact, it does *not* bring out at all the significance of the great centenary of peace. Its true title should be: "One Hundred Years of Quarreling." Nearly one-fourth of its pages are devoted to a grossly partisan and misleading account of the American Revolution, the ill-feeling of the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic years, and the War of 1812. Two-thirds of the remaining pages record thirty odd quarrels which arose during the century, and only one-fifth of the book is devoted to the peaceful settlement of these quarrels. Even the short account of these peaceful settlements is marred by a grudging and ill-natured spirit, and the credit for the avoidance of war is given wholly to Americans—wherever at all possible to some Massachusetts statesman. Even the illustrations of the book are in keeping with its contentious spirit. Only

seven of them are devoted to peace-making or the peacemakers, while twelve are old English cartoons ridiculing America, or the portraits of the makers of mischief between the two countries. Emulating "Hamlet with Hamlet left out," not the slightest reference is made in these pages to the Rush-Bagot Treaty of 1817, which stilled the war drums and furled the battle flags along the nearly four thousand miles of our Canadian boundary line, while Great Britain's assent to the Geneva Arbitration of the *Alabama* claims is ascribed to England's unpreparedness for war and her fear of losing Canada! The prime feature of the Cleveland-Olney exaggeration of the Monroe Doctrine, which was repudiated by our own country almost as soon as it was uttered, is passed over in silence, and President Cleveland's bellicose message which brought the two countries to the verge of war is "illuminated" by the words: "England was surprised, and operators in the stock market were greatly annoyed. . . . President Cleveland, moreover, however much Wall street might cry out, had the country with him, and no one today, I think, can question the absolute soundness of his position."

An author who, from his seat in the United States Senate, heard only the voice of Wall Street in the mighty "Thou shalt not commit murder" which went up from the hearts of the two civilized nations to their respective rulers in that terrible crisis, and who so obviously exults in the clenching of the mailed fist which precipitated that crisis, can scarcely be expected to interpret aright the hundred years of peace which are presumably to be celebrated by peace-lovers, peacemakers, and peace-keepers in a genuinely peaceful spirit.

The above remarks may not themselves be considered as couched in a wholly peaceful spirit; but they are merely the echoes of a righteous indignation aroused by sundry recent indications, like the book referred to, that there is grave danger of side-tracking what ought to be a great, cosmopolitan, wholly charitable celebration of one of the most important and fruitful facts of human history into a petty, provincial, self-glorifying, and ancestor-worshiping exaltation and exaggeration of the victories won on land and sea by the "Boys of 1812" over the "Red-coats." Even at the recent conference of the National Committee for Celebration of the One Hundred Years of Peace, held in Richmond, Va., some weeks ago, this danger was seen to be a grave and imminent one, and although the sense of the committee as a whole was shown to be overwhelmingly against such a more-than-criminal blunder, it was but too apparent that an earnest endeavor should be made to bring the celebration under safe and sane leadership. Such leadership can appeal successfully to the sound common sense, and even to the sense of humor, of the American public to prevent historians of Senator Lodge's school from turning into a drum and trumpet jubilation what ought to be a truly international celebration of the mutual achievements of all the varied peoples of these United States. In *this* celebration, at the very least, the so-called patriotic condemnations of the General William Hulls and exaltation of the Captain Isaac Hulls, the execration of "the Britishers" and the laudation of our own "Old Hickories," "Rough and Readies," and "Rough Riders" should give place to the just and adequate and profitable

\* "One Hundred Years of Peace," by Henry Cabot Lodge. Macmillan & Co., 1913.

appreciation of the economic, educational, æsthetic, and moral victories of the Century of Peace, which *should* be far more renowned than those of the War of 1812, and which may well make the whole world exclaim: "This is the Lord's doing; it is marvelous in our eyes."

## "Organized Insanity" or The Hague.

A REPLY TO ADMIRAL MAHAN.

By George W. Nasmyth.

In the remarkable indictment of the international armament competition published by Mr. Lloyd George as an interview in the *London Daily Chronicle* of January 1, 1914, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer refers to the overwhelming expenditure on armaments as "organized insanity." "No country has gained in strength as a result of this growth of expenditure," he said. "We are all relatively exactly where we were. I cannot think of any advantage which has been reaped by any country in the world from this increase of military and naval expenditure. But I can think of a good deal of harm which has been done to all countries. . . . The common sense of the industrial classes, be they capitalist or labor, has risen against this organized insanity. This is a propitious moment for reconsidering the question of armaments."

This condition of "organized insanity" and the folly of the international competition of armaments is being realized by "the man in the street" in all countries with increasing vividness. It has been the conspicuous service of Norman Angell\* to point out the intimate connection between this "organized insanity" and the dominance, in our thinking on the subject, of certain fallacies and outworn axioms concerning the rôle of military power in modern international relations. Everything which tends to confused thinking on the great international question of armaments, therefore, leads us deeper into the grip of this "organized insanity," and every effort toward intellectual sanitation prepares the way for a solution of the armament problem and a more rational organization of the world.

One of the most flagrant examples of the fallacies and loose reasoning, unfortunately so common in the discussion of the armament question, is found in an article entitled "The Folly of The Hague," by Admiral Mahan, recently spread over the country as an editorial in the magazine section of the Sunday newspapers of New York and other cities. The confusion of thought upon one of the most important and vital questions of the day revealed by this article is so great that it seems worth while to analyze the reasoning and point out some of the fallacies, especially as they are typical of many of the arguments advanced by the defenders of militarism at the present time.

A fundamental confusion in regard to the nature of physical force, in Admiral Mahan's mind, leads to a

curious method of reasoning in a circle. When he is confronted with the moral arguments against war, he usually takes refuge in the thesis that the causes of war are economic and material. But when he is overwhelmed with the proofs of the economic futility of war, he falls back upon the claim that the causes of war are ideal and moral, not economic and material. Thus, in his "Armaments and Arbitration," he says (p. 113):

"The armaments of the European States now are not so much for protection against conquest as to secure to themselves the utmost possible share of the unexploited or imperfectly exploited regions of the world—the outlying markets or storehouses of raw material, which, under national control, shall minister to national emoluments."

This naked statement of the materialistic purpose of armament for aggression and exploitation is in striking contrast with his definition of the purpose of armaments in his latest article. Here he holds armaments up as the beneficent power which protects the quiet and weak and allows them to sleep securely. His new point of view is:

"Armament is the organization and consecration of force as a factor in the maintenance of justice, order, and peace. It is the highest expression of that element in civilization—force—which has created and now upholds society, giving efficacy to the pronouncements of law, whether by the legislature or in the courts. Organized force alone enables the quiet and the weak to go about their business and to sleep securely, safe from the assaults of violence without or within."

It is clear that Admiral Mahan would not contradict himself so flatly as in the passages quoted above if he did not labor under a fundamental confusion, which runs all through his writing, as to the real nature of physical force.

### Three Kinds of Armed Force.

Three kinds of physical force must be distinguished in order to reason clearly upon the subject and to avoid the process of self-contradiction to which Admiral Mahan falls a victim when he thus includes all three under the one term armament. These three kinds of physical force are:

I. Force used for the maintenance of order—police force.

II. Force used to neutralize aggression—defense.

III. Force used for aggression—attack.

It is clearly the first of these—police force—that Admiral Mahan means when he speaks of armament as the consecration of force for the maintenance of justice, order, and peace. But this is just what armament is not. Its purposes are confined almost entirely to defense and attack. We do not speak of a mining town, with no central authority for maintaining order, and with every inhabitant—gamblers, thieves, and good citizens alike—armed to the teeth and shooting at sight, as having a very high degree of justice, order, and peace, although there is armament enough and to spare. This is the present condition of anarchy in international relations, with no strong central authority to enforce order, and armament confined to the functions of attack and defense. But security must be had at all costs, and as mankind, driven by economic pressure and the conviction of the folly of armaments, sets about to erect

\* See "The Great Illusion, a Study of the Relation of Military Power to National Welfare," and "Arms and Industry, a Study of the Foundations of International Policy": G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, for a demonstration that armaments are morally, socially, and economically futile under modern conditions.